

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/858,268	ETHEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Khanh B. Pham	2166

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** RCE

(1) Khanh B. Pham.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. LeRoy Maunu, Applicant's representative.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 May 2006

**Time:** 1pm

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*10, 12, 17-20*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Nishigaya et al. (US 2001/0010056 A1)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggests canceling claims 17-20 to place the application in condition for allowance because they do not recite all limitations of allowable claims 1, 13-14. The examiner also proposes an amendment to claims 10, 12 to remove redundant limitations. Applicant's representative agrees with the examiner's suggestions and authorizes an Examiner's amendment.